

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 5, 2005.

Claim 23 is amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-35 are now pending in this application. The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. No new matter is introduced. The amendment is made to clarify the claim by correcting a typographical error. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Jacobson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,866,900). Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of these claims.

Applicant cannot find in Jacobson et al. (hereafter Jacobson) a disclosure, a teaching, or a suggestion of a method including correcting the output image sequence generated by a second subset of detectors in a focal plane array using the correction provided to a first subset of detectors as recited in claim 1. Jacobson relates to calibrating a focal plane array in which Jacobson discusses adjustments made to correction factors based on comparing an output of a first detector at a first rotation position with an output of a second detector at a second rotation position. *See, Jacobson Summary, column 1, line 54 - column 2, line 9*. Applicant submits that using a comparison between two outputs does not disclose, teach, or suggest correcting a second detector using the correction to a first detector. Therefore, Applicant submits that Jacobson does not does not teach each and every claim element of claim 1 and that Jacobson does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that Jacobson does not anticipate claim 1 and that claim 1 is patentable over Jacobson for at least the reasons stated above.

Additionally, claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 1 and are patentable over Jacobson for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claims 1-3, and reconsideration and allowance of these claims

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 4-12 depend on patentable claim 1 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Thus, Applicant requests withdrawal of these objections to claims 4-12, and reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

Claims 13-35 were allowed. Applicant acknowledges allowance of claims 13-35. The Office Action makes statements regarding limitations of several claims and contents of the art with respect to a distinguishing feature of claim 13. Applicant has neither verified nor accepted the accuracy of these statements. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the relevant claims may be allowable for one or more reasons in addition to and/or in alternative to those reasons identified in the Office Action. Applicant reserves the right to further address one or more aspects of these statements in the Office Action as may later be necessary or desirable.

Assertion of Pertinence

Applicant has not responded to the assertion of pertinence stated for the patents cited, but not relied upon, by the Office Action since these patents are not relied upon as part of the rejections in this Office Action. Applicant is expressly not conceding they have any pertinence and reserves the right to respond more fully should any of them form a part of some future rejection.